

Now, as threats to international peace and security continue to evolve, the Constitutional War Powers Resolution, H.J. Res. 53, rededicates Congress to its primary constitutional role of deciding when to use force abroad.

In 1793, James Madison said, “. . . The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature . . . the executive has no right, in any case, to decide the question, whether there is or is not cause for declaring war.”

The Framers of our Constitution sought to decentralize the war powers of the United States and construct a balance between the political branches.

□ 1945

The War Powers Resolution of 1973 aimed to clarify the intent of the constitutional Framers and to ensure that Congress and the President share in the decision-making process in the event of armed conflict. Yet, since the enactment of the resolution, time and again Presidents have maintained that the resolution's consultation, reporting, and congressional authorization requirements are unconstitutional obstacles to executive authority.

By more fully clarifying the war powers of the President and the Congress, the legislation I've introduced, H.J. Res. 53, the Constitutional War Powers Resolution, improves upon the War Powers Resolution of 1973 in a number of ways. It clearly spells out the powers that the Congress and the President must exercise collectively, as well as the defensive measures the Commander in Chief may exercise without congressional approval. It also provides a more robust reporting requirement that would enable Congress to be more informed and to have greater oversight. And it protects and preserves the checks and balances the Framers intended in the decision to bring our Nation into war.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to congressional hearings on this critical issue. The time for Congress to meet its constitutional duty is long overdue.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I would like to ask God to continue to bless our men and women in Afghanistan and Iraq, and to ask God to continue to bless the families of our men and women in uniform.

ECONOMIC ISOLATIONISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, as the two Democratic contenders duke it out in the Presidential campaign, there's one issue that they both seem very eager to be identified with. And it's very unfortunate, it's the issue of economic isolationism. This kind of policy is as dangerous as it is inconsistent with their own rhetoric.

Both Democratic contenders like to talk about the need to enhance our Na-

tion's image and increase our leadership in the international community. They talk about diplomacy and soft power, and then they turn around and insist we try to withdraw from the worldwide marketplace and cede our global economic leadership. It has even been suggested by them that we go back on a 14-year deal with our two closest neighbors, including our neighbor to the north who has been such a key political ally.

Perhaps this outlandish rhetoric is delivered with a wink and a nod. Perhaps it's merely an attempt to score a few political points without any intention to actually dismantle the deep economic and political ties that we share with our trading partners in this hemisphere. Frankly, I hope that that is the case. But either way, Madam Speaker, this is very dangerous rhetoric.

NAFTA has long been addressed by those running for office as though it were an unmitigated disaster; no one seems to want to touch it with a 10-foot pole. After all, everyone knows that NAFTA has hurt our economy and cost us millions of jobs. Right? Wrong. In 1994, when Bill Clinton sent NAFTA to the Congress, the gross domestic product in this country was \$6.9 trillion. Today, we have a \$14.1 trillion economy. In other words, we have more than doubled the size of our economy in the NAFTA-era. When adjusted for inflation, the numbers are still very striking, with 50 percent growth since 1994. During the same period, 25 million jobs have been created, while our labor force has grown by 18 million.

Fourteen years of NAFTA have seen our economy grow considerably while more Americans are working than ever before and new jobs have abounded. To put it bluntly, anyone who says that NAFTA has destroyed our economy is flat out wrong. Not only has the predicted “giant sucking sound” that we heard about during the NAFTA debate not come to pass, but the precise opposite has taken place.

But, Madam Speaker, NAFTA is just one component of the complex relationships that entail our global engagement, where the economic and the political are inextricably entwined, and nowhere is this role more critical than in our own neighborhood. We have spent years and countless resources promoting democracy in this hemisphere. The rise of Hugo Chavez in Venezuela and his cohorts throughout the region have demonstrated that authoritarianism in our backyard is still a reality. As he sends troops to the border he shares with our friend and ally, Colombia, we are reminded that tyranny in our hemisphere still poses very grave threats.

NAFTA, CAFTA, the Peru Free Trade Agreement, and the proposed agreements with Colombia and Panama build upon the twin pillars of liberty: democratic governments and free markets. They enhance our economic strength with new opportunities and

give us greater leverage to ensure that we have peaceful and prosperous neighbors. And we know that peace and prosperity, Madam Speaker, go hand in hand.

We simply cannot disengage economically without disengaging politically. Engagement through trade is our source of strength and our leadership, and we would disengage to our peril. Those who regard our leadership in the international community so casually that they would trash it for political gain threaten not only our own prosperity, but our ability to play a positive role in this hemisphere and around the globe as we seek to grow our economies and to grow the economies of our neighbors.

U.S.-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, to urge the Speaker of this House to bring the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement to this House floor for a vote.

And let me tell you this: this agreement is good for the State that I represent. It's good for Colombia. It's good for the United States. It's good for Illinois farmers. It's good for Illinois workers. And it's good for Illinois manufacturing.

And I would note that in my district I have 8,000 Caterpillar workers, union Caterpillar workers who are manufacturing workers. And under this agreement, I note under the U.S.-Colombia Trade Agreement that our machinery exports see their tariffs imposed on Illinois-made construction equipment eliminated on day one. Now, you think about it, mining equipment used in Colombia is \$1 million equipment, that's a \$100,000 tax on U.S.-made products eliminated on day one.

Currently, Illinois exports \$214 million to Colombia, and that's just the beginning. According to the International Trade Commission, Illinois is a big winner. Pork products will increase 72 percent, according to their economic analysis. Corn and soybeans will see increased sales to Colombia. Fabricated metal products, processed foods, and chemicals will all see increases. And, again, it's expected that machinery, manufactured machinery, like products made by John Deere and Navistar and Caterpillar, will increase 15 percent.

Agriculture. The leaders of agriculture will tell you the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement is the best for agriculture in the history of all trade negotiations. And let's not forget that 80 percent of U.S. exports are currently taxed when they enter Colombia, and they will become duty free immediately. That will allow us to